



"To thine own self be true, and it must follow,

as the night the day, thou canst not then be false to any man."

BY ROBT. A. THOMPSON & CO.

PICKENS COURT HOUSE, S. C., SATURDAY, AUGUST 31, 1867.

VOL. II. NO. 49.

POLITICAL.

BY REQUEST.

HON. B. H. HILL'S SPEECH

ON THE

CONDITION OF THE COUNTRY.

Delivered at Atlanta on the 16th July, 1867.

Ladies and Fellow-Citizens: Human governments, like everything else human, naturally tend to decay. They can only be preserved by constant watchfulness, courage, and adherence to correct principles. The remarks apply with unusual force to free governments, which are the most difficult of all to maintain. If we, the people of the United States, were the first in history who had attempted the experiment of living under a Democratic or Republican form of government, we might be excused if we failed to discover the symptoms of approaching death, and to apply the remedies to preserve our liberty and the blessings we have heretofore enjoyed. But we are not the first who have made this experiment. Other peoples and nations, for thousands of years, have had Commonwealths, Republics, and Democracies, which have risen and fallen time almost without number. I but assert a great truth—one which finds no contradiction or exception in all history—when I say that the great leading and substantial causes of the decay of freedom in all countries have ever been the same. How inexcusable must we be if we fail to discover the symptoms, and how cowardly and recreant if we fail to apply the proper remedy to prevent so foul a death!

No people ever commenced to build up a free government under such favorable auspices as we. What a climate, soil, variety of productions and material resources do we possess; and what an ancestry and what a common struggle for liberty did our fathers pass through? Did any people ever before commence with such advantages? Rome commenced as a small city, and was despised by the barbarians around it. She extended her power by her arms, and increased till at last she became mistress of the world. We commenced with such a people, country and productions as no people ever had before, and we had fewer discussions and elements of discord than any people ever enjoyed from the beginning, as if to separate us from the crimes and corrupting influences of the old world, spread out this great continent before us, with the wide sea to separate us from them, with no influence of monarchy and oppressive systems to threaten or make war upon us. If we fail, it will be by our own folly. What excuse can we render to our posterity and to the world, if we, in this day, with the lessons of history before us, allow free institutions to perish on this continent? And our race will have been the soonest run. We have not yet lived a century. It is but seventy-eight years since the Constitution was formed, and but ninety-one years since independence was declared by our fathers, while the Commonwealth of Rome lived four hundred years before the measures which produced her decay were proposed. What a spectacle! The best people, the richest soil, the most valuable productions, established as if by the providence of God, as a new era in the history of the world—and bidding fair to be the shortest lived of any free government in the history of nations!

There is no difficulty whatever—and I assert it without fear of contradiction—in discovering when and how a nation is dying. I cannot now go into an analysis of all the symptoms of national decay and death. It is only important to present the leading one which controls all others—which existing, produces all others, and which being remedied, cures all others. Then hear it: the great symptom of the decay and death of a government is the disregard of the FUNDAMENTAL LAW of that government. Whenever a people come to treat lightly their own fundamental law, they have arrived at the most dangerous point that is possible, short of entire destruction. Republics, above all other kind of governments, are maintained by respect for law. If the people of the United States fail to have a sacred regard for their own law—which is not like that of other nations, to be ascertained by decision, or by searching, but is a plain and wisely written Constitution—they will deserve the awful fate that awaits them; and he who disregards its plain language has no excuse to shield himself from the infamy of a traitor! [Applause.] Old as it is—trampled upon, torn and tattered as it is—my theme to-day is the Constitution of our country and for all our country. [Applause.] I charge before Heaven and the American people this day, that every evil by which we have been afflicted is attributable to a departure from the Constitution. Tinkers may work, quacks may prescribe, and demagogues may deceive, but I declare to you that there is no remedy for us, and no hope to escape the threatened evils, but in adhering to the Constitution.

Fellow-citizens: Pardon me while I say, that in presenting my views, I think of no living man, individually, to whom my remarks are to apply. I have come to talk freely to you about the dangers of this country. Little minds ascribe little objects to those whose views they do not agree with, and he who has obtained an unenviable reputation whose friends say "you mean him," when I am speaking of treachery and showing the evil consequences of a certain line of policy, I have no personal attacks to make on any one, even if I have one. God knows if I could, with my own hands, I would gladly place a crown of imperishable honor on the brow of my most bitter foe, if I could there, by personal country from the perils that environ it! [Applause.] But if I have an enemy, and have a vindictive spirit, and desired him to become forever infamous, I could ask

no more of him than that he should support the hellish schemes of those who are now seeking to subvert the Constitution and destroy our liberty. He is digging a grave for himself which posterity will never water with a tear. Let him alone. I have come to discuss the present phase of the revolution.

We have had a war which raged furiously for four years. It originated simply in a difference of opinion as to our rights under the Constitution. This difference existed from the first. It existed among the framers of the Constitution. It could not be settled by argument, and an appeal was made to the sword. It was an open, manly fight. There was nothing secret or ambiguous in the issue. It was waged by men influenced in the masses by patriotic emotions on both sides; and it was not to destroy the Constitution, but to assert on each side their different views. On our side it was asserted that the States were separate and independent sovereignties, and that the Constitution was a compact, which each party was at liberty to dissolve at will, and so we seceded and declared ourselves out of the Union. On the other hand, it was contended that we were not out of the Union—notwithstanding our secession acts; and that the Constitution was not a compact, but a binding law upon the States resulting from a compact, and therefore no one of the number could dissolve the connection at will. Upon this issue we went to war. The war was fought till we laid down our arms and agreed to what our enemies said—that we were in the Union.

But there is now another question to settle. It is still within the range of argument. Its proportions are huge. The issues are startling. It is not a difference of opinion as to what the Constitution means, and what are our rights under it; but its object is plainly, unmistakably, to set aside the Constitution and provide something else. I have never doubted that we were coming to this issue. In speeches made by me, five, six, eight, and ten years ago, I predicted this, and every page of our history since that time has verified the correctness of the prediction. The people of the North honestly love the Constitution, but the leaders there hate it, and intend to destroy it, and the convulsion through which we have passed has thrown the opportunity of making the effort into their hands, and the present military bills and the one which is not yet pronounced are the means adapted to accomplish their design. There is a remarkable feature in these measures, that while force is employed to execute them, they are yet nominally submitted to us for our acceptance or rejection.

I object to the whole scheme, because it is unconstitutional. A distinguished man—pardon me, I ought to say a notorious individual—said to me a few days ago, that I ought not to waste time to prove the unconstitutionality of these measures—a thing every man, woman and child in the country knew—and yet he was for accepting! He spoke truthfully. That tottering, gray-haired candidate in Pennsylvania for perpetual infamy, who is building for himself a monument of malignity that will overtop the pyramids of Egypt, said the Constitution had nothing to do with it. I shall never get done shuddering, and horrors will never cease to rise up in my mind, when I see men taking an oath to support the Constitution, and then legislating to put in force measures which are outside of it. A great many of our own people flippantly say the Constitution is dead. Then your rights, and hopes for the future, and all hope for your children are dead. I ask every man, if the Constitution is dead, why are we always, every day, and at every new step required to take an oath to support it?

Now, I affirm that these military bills are not only contrary to the Constitution, but directly in the face of the amnesty oath you were required to take after the surrender. The Government thought proper, in accepting your submission, to take your oath to support the Constitution of the United States and the Union of the States. Why was that oath required if the Constitution was dead?

But it is said again that we are not in the Union. Then why swear to support the Constitution of these States? What "Union" does that mean? When you took that oath was it the Union of the of the Northern States alone that you swore to support? What business have you with that Union? No, it is the Union of all the States known to the Constitution that you have sworn to support.

But they say that oath was prescribed by the President, and that he is loyal. Then I must answer a fool according to his folly, and a traitor according to his treason. What do they require who passed these bills—this military juggernaut? They require every man who registers his name to vote, to swear to support the Constitution, and counsel and persuade others to do so—and still it is said the Constitution has nothing to do with it! They say the scheme is outside of the Constitution, and yet in the process of carrying it out, they require an oath to support the Constitution and to counsel and persuade others to do so! That is more than Mr. Johnson ever required in the oath which he prescribed.

It is my business to support the Constitution, and my duty and pleasure to persuade others to do so. Some of you who favor the acceptance of the military bills take an oath to this effect, and still intend to vote for a convention which you admit to be contrary to the Constitution! How is this? If you have a conscience, I have said enough. If you vote for the Convention you are PERJURED! [Tremendous applause.] O, I pity the race of colored people who have never been taught what an oath is, not what the Constitution means. They are drawn up by a selfish conspiracy of traitors to inflict a death-

blow upon the life of the Republic, swearing them to a falsehood! They are to begin their political life by perjury to accomplish treason! I would not visit the penalty upon them. They are neither legally nor morally responsible, it is you—educated, designing white men—who thus devote yourselves to the unholy work—who are the guilty parties! You are morally and legally perjured traitors! You perjure yourselves and perjure the people to help your treason! [Immense applause.] You can't escape it! You may boast of it now, while passion is rife, but the time will come when the very thought will wither your soul and make you hide from the face of mankind.

I shall discharge the obligation of the amnesty oath. It required me to support the Constitution and the emancipation of the negro, and I do. I will not bind my soul to a new slavery, to hell, by violating it. I talk plainly, but I simply want to strike through the incrustation of the hardened conscience, and make men feel and realize their true situation.

I have proved that these military bills violate the Constitution, and that you, in carrying them out, violate it and your amnesty oath and your registry oath. And what is your purpose? It must be a great good you seek to induce you to commit so much crime and folly.

Sometimes men wink at what is by strict technicalities wrong in the individual, to accomplish some great good to the public. I do not recognize the correctness of such action; but what do you propose by trampling upon the Constitution and violating your own solemn oaths? Is it to save the State and preserve liberty? This is not the object, but the purpose is as infamous as the measure resorted to to effect it. You first propose to abrogate your State governments by authority of the so-called Congress—a mere conclave of a portion of the members of that body. By whom is this dictated? The principle that whoever forms a government should form it for themselves as well as for others, is a correct one; but the men who propose for us do not live in any of the ten States to be affected by their legislation. It is not made to suit our people, but to suit themselves, while they are in position, in a manner to suit themselves, you will not be accepted by them; nay, you violate the Constitution to subvert the Government. And by carrying out these measures you disfranchise your own people. Suppose you concede, for argument, that it is right to enfranchise all the negroes; if this be right, by what principle of law or morals do we disfranchise the white people? "O, but," you say, "the whites have been rebels." Then they should all be disfranchised, and not a part of them. Besides, the government you are to frame is to be a civil government, and last for all time, and for peace, when there can be no rebels. I see it stated that General Sickles has advised that the disfranchising feature be repealed or modified, and for the reason that the enfranchised class are not fit to fill the offices. Well, if he has done so, he has acted wisely, and has shown himself capable of appreciating one truth. And it is a great truth—one that will hide a multitude of sins; and it might be well for his fame if this recommendation alone could be remembered of his administration. In the face of the fact that a republican government can rest upon and be perpetuated only by the virtue and intelligence of the people, you propose to exclude the most intelligent from participating in the Government forever!

You will by these measures inaugurate a war of races. A people who will abrogate their own governments and disfranchise the most intelligent of them at the dictation of those who are not to be affected thereby, and live under the dictation of a foreign power, have no conscience; but if you have a conscience I hope to reach it. By all you hold dear I warn you that by accepting these military bills you inaugurate a measure that will exterminate the African race. Some of you who have come among us are taking the negro by the arm—telling him that you are his friend, and that you gave him his liberty! Ye hypocrites! Ye white serpents! Ye mean in your hearts to deceive and buy up the negro vote for your own benefit. [Applause.] The negroes know no better; but I will ask them: If these men are faithful to the Constitution of the country, how can they be faithful to you? Yet these men admit in the very act that they are disregarding the Constitution! They take an oath to support it with the purpose and intent formed beforehand to violate it, and vote for measures contrary to it! They are not fit to be trusted by any animal, dog or man! [Applause.] Such a man would betray his pointer, and such a woman sell her poodle! They are not capable of being the friends of anybody but themselves. I don't pity the whites so much who are to suffer by these measures. "You know your duty and did it not," and if you are bent on with many stripes we have the authority of Scripture for saying that your punishment is just; but to see the Africans led off by a clasp trap which they don't understand, and used because they don't understand it, and thus led to the slaughter by men who are faithless to every principle—under the belief that they are being elevated and exercising God-given rights, is enough to make any man feel sick at heart and experience the deepest pity for the unfortunate race.

This is not the first time that such things have been attempted. Unfortunately, there have before been both fools and knaves in the world, and some of you, it would seem, will not learn wisdom from the lessons of the past. If the Constitution is dead, we are outside of it, and pray, what government have we? We

have nothing, in that case, but the will of an unlawful conclave, and don't you know this means anarchy and then despotism and tyranny? What inducement is held out to you to accept their propositions? You say it is to get back into the Union! and for this you are willing to submit to disfranchisement and the inauguration of a policy that tends to a war of races! all to get back into the Union—just where you are already, and always were!

What do you want to get back into that sort of Union for? If you are not now in it, what can you expect by getting in such as they present to you? You say it is to get representation in the Union! Is not Kentucky in the Union? Has she any representation? The telegraph informs us that a resolution has been introduced into the so-called Congress making inquiries whether Maryland, Delaware and Kentucky have State governments or not! Are you so stupid as not to see what all this means? The result will be the substitution of the Radical party for all governments, both State and Federal; and the substitution of Radical will for all law! Take that home with you and digest it. That's where you are going! Kentucky is excluded from representation because it is alleged her representatives were voted for by disloyal men. What is meant by disloyal? Every man who does not support the Radical party will soon be declared disloyal, and every State which does not vote the Radical ticket will be disloyal, and her government illegal. I tell you, unless patriotism shall wake up from the stupor which the horrid confusion of war has given it, the Radical party will be our only government, and Radical will be our only law.

I look for this revolution to go on. Whoever thinks this war on the Constitution will stop within the ten States is a madman or a simpleton to be pitied, or a knave to be despised. I have expected them to take charge of Connecticut because she dared to elect a Governor that did not agree with the Radical party; and sure enough Sumner, in a late letter, strikes the key note. He says a similar bill for all the States is a short cut to universal suffrage. The so-called Congress, immediately on its meeting, took charge of Kentucky, and excluded her whole delegation, with one exception. If they can reject these, they can reject every one who differs with them. They will receive. I do not care what may have been their sins heretofore, but what will be their sins hereafter? I tell you, he is as good as the saints in Heaven for Radical purposes. [Applause.] They care not for race or color, nor for antecedents, if you now favor Radical schemes you are loyal, and if you oppose them you are disloyal!

But you say you are in favor of going into the Union, because if you do not your property will be confiscated. A gentleman of this city a few days ago said to me that he was in favor of the acceptance of these military bills because he thought it the best we could do. I said to him: "You do not say that for yourself, but for your brick stores!" [Applause.] But you are not half so wise as you are knavish! You would lose the Constitution and the country to save your brick stores, and then by your very course you will lose your brick stores also! I am ashamed to talk or use arguments about confiscation in time of peace! It is a war power, not known to international law except as a war power, to be used only in time of war, upon an enemy's goods! Confiscation in time of peace is neither more nor less than ROBBERY!

But you say they have got the power and they will exercise it, unless we do as they bid us. And will you, in this case, abandon your only protection! It is like going out into the highway and surrendering your purse to the robber to keep him from taking it!

I could introduce a great deal of high authority to establish this point, but I will not insult the Radical portion of this audience by reading from any authority for them except from a Massachusetts Judge. Here is what he says:

"It has been supposed that if the Government meant to have the rights of a belligerent, then, after the rebellion is suppressed, it will have the rights of conquest; that a State and its inhabitants may be permanent, divested of all political privileges, and treated as foreign territory acquired by arms. This is an error, a grave and dangerous error. Belligerent rights cannot be exercised where there are no belligerents."

That is what I said: "Confiscation is only a war measure, and ceases with the war."—Again:

"When the United States take possession of a rebel district, they merely vindicate their pre-existing title. Under despotic governments the right of confiscation may be unlimited; but under our government the right of sovereignty over any portion of a State is given and limited by the Constitution, and will be the same after the war as it was before."

There is one Lot in Massachusetts, and if Abraham were alive to-day I would have him pray to God to spare that State and trust it—not only to ten men, but—even to one. There is at least one good man in it, and he is a Judge, and dares to proclaim to all that security to property is given by the Constitution the same after as before the war. And now I will read for the patriots of the audience something from the most distinguished of all writers on international law:

"When a sovereign, arrogating to himself the absolute disposal of a people whom he has conquered, attempts to reduce them to slavery, he perpetrates the state of warfare between that nation and himself. Should it be said that in such a case, there may be peace and a kind of compact by which the conqueror consents to spare the lives of the vanquished on condition that they acknowledge themselves his slaves: he who makes such an as-

sertion is ignorant that war gives no right to take away the life of an enemy who has laid down his arms and submitted. But let us not dispute the point; let the man who holds such principles of jurisprudence keep them for his own use and benefit; he well deserves to be subject to such a law. But men of spirit to whom life is nothing—less than nothing, unless sweetened with liberty, will always conceive themselves at war with that oppressor, though actual hostilities are suspended on their part, through want of ability."

My friends, this was written by a man who lived in desperate times, by a man who was taught under a despotic government; and how his love of liberty and law shames the praters about loyalty in free America!

But I will dwell no more on this subject. Confiscation is the law of enemies in war, and in peace it is the law of the robber. If they have the will to rob you, you will never escape by submitting to their power. If you submit, give up the law and substitute the will of the robber; he boldly avows that it is his purpose not to give the black man his rights, but to bring about such measures and so to shape things as to perpetuate the rule of the Radical party! Every man who joins the party and can satisfy them that he will sincerely help in this work, will be accepted. They will put their arms around your necks and call you brothers. [Applause.] You can make a friend of the devil upon these same terms, [laughter and applause.] and there is but little difference between them.—[Great applause.] If you please the one you will go to the other, and I am not sure but you will get what you deserve, but I object to your taking the country with you. [Immense applause.]

But, Oh! it is said to see the Constitution trampled upon and the country destroyed, only to perpetuate their hellish dynasty; and then to see some of our own people join in this unholy work, calling upon us to submit and become the agents of our own dishonor! This is sad, sorrowful, and fills me with shame!

These bills (the Military Bills) propose at every step to abrogate the Constitution—trample upon the State and its laws—to blot out every hope—to perjure every man who accepts them, with every principle of honor, justice and safety disregarded, trampled upon and despised—to perpetuate the power of their wicked authors. Can this be a nation? I feel truly thankful in my heart that I have an answer which lifts my soul amidst all the gloom and apprehension of the hour. Some of you may not appreciate it, but to me it is the only oasis in this desert. This scheme will never, NEVER succeed, and I proclaim its ultimate failure to-day in your hearing. [Unbounded applause.] I know that some think it will. The air is full of the words of those who proclaim that there is no power to prevent it. Men have, before this, been weak and foolish, and cowards and traitors have before believed as you talk now, but I have a reason for the faith that is in me, which is absolutely sublime in the strength of its foundations.

1st. It will fail because it is not possible to perpetuate a government of force under the forms of a democracy. It may take some time to comprehend this thought, but you will not forget it. That which is now proposed is force. It is proposed by men who do not live in this State, and whose agents do not live here; and it is sought to be accomplished by military power, but under the pretense of your sanction—not to please yourselves, but them. There is not an instance in history where a government of force has been perpetuated under the forms of free institutions. It is an impossibility, and can never succeed. [Applause.]

2d. But it is sought to be accomplished by deceit and fraud, which cannot much longer escape detection. The masses of the people of the North love the Constitution and fought for it and the Union, but the leaders did not fight for it, and do not love it; and they now seek to destroy it under pretense that we must give some further guarantee for our future good behavior than merely supporting the Constitution. As soon as the means by which their deceit and fraud have been covered up are removed, the scheme will be crushed to death, by the people. It is a double shaped monster, like the sentinel at Hell gate, which can live nowhere except in a political pandemonium.

And what must be the result? I do not say we will come out of all this with free institutions preserved, but this scheme can never succeed. A despotism over the whole country and over all the people guilty and innocent alike may ensue. You'll fail, but you may bring ruin upon all. Whenever you pull down the temple of liberty you also will be crushed by the fall. You cannot level or lower us and elevate yourselves. We must either all rise or all go down together. Despotism may come, empires may rise and fall, but whether they do or not, we shall not have the reign of a Radical party. Understand me: If I say a man cannot live high up in the air, I do not mean he cannot go up in a balloon and remain for a time; or if I say a man cannot live under water, I do not say he cannot go down in a diving bell and remain awhile; but the Radicals will as certainly fail to perpetuate their power under the scheme as that a man will fail who attempts to dwell in the air, or drown who makes his home under water. Such a government would be unnatural—a political monstrosity, and cannot possibly last; but you may destroy the forms as well as the principles of free government, and then you will have a monarchy, an autocracy, an empire, or a despotism, as the case may be.

This very scheme was attempted in Rome by much better men than your Radicals are, and for a much better reason than you give. It is not original with you. You are but plagiarizing traitors at best, and get your scheme from the criminals of long ago. If I did steal, I would try to steal something better and from a more respectable source. If you will examine, and compare with former times, the productions of such men as Stevens, Phillips, and Sumner, and their lesser followers and second-hand plagiarizers down South, you will find all their miserable jargon about "liberty and equality," the "natural right of man," and "born-right of manhood suffrage," are borrowed from the men who fomented social and civil wars in Rome, and which have been repeated in every age since, by those who have no statesmanship but the devilish ability of exciting ignorant men to cut each other's throats. Republican Rome had a large number of slaves, freedmen, and non-voting citizens. She had a landed aristocracy embracing comparatively few of her people. An agrarian law was proposed, and for a time was immensely popular, but it failed and its first author was slain. His brother renewed the law and enlarged it by proposing suffrage to the slaves and freedmen with equal political rights. It was said "there could be no freedom without equality." But the brother's plan perished. Then a great general became the leader of the Radicals of that day, and he had more fame and merit and ability than all the Radical party of his day combined, but he also failed. And why did they all fail? Because they were attempting to engrave a government of force and robbery upon republican forms—attempting the absurd task of making equal things which God had made unequal—attempting equality by taking that which industrious and frugal men had made and giving it to thievery vagabond and by depositing in the keeping of ignorance and vice powers and trusts which intelligence alone can know how to exercise and preserve. But by the struggle Republican Rome perished and never knew liberty again. Nor was this all; her history from the beginning of the agrarian attempt was one of blood, and faction, and waste, and ruin, until the goal of Empire was reached. In the social and civil wars which marked the struggle, more than seven hundred thousand of her best citizens were slain; and besides these, whole populations of some of her most populous territories may be said to have been so crazy in leaving the country—the only Ark of safety—that our Heavenly father has doomed us to perish, but I am gratified with a hope that it is not so. If, not, there is but one method for our rescue, and that is by a prompt restoration of the Constitution. Will it come? Will we escape an agrarian war with resulting despotism, and save our institutions for our institutions for our children? I hope we shall; I believe we shall. Though a great effort is being made—a designed effort—to destroy us as Rome was destroyed, I believe the effort will fail. I have great faith in the Anglo-Saxon blood. I derive great encouragement from Anglo-Saxon history. Our liberty was not born in a day. It is not the work of one generation. It is the fruits of a hundred struggles, and its guaranties have been perfecting for eight hundred years. Many have been the efforts to destroy it. Often the English Constitution was trampled on. Often traitors sought to substitute arbitrary will for well established law, and often have the people for a time been misled. But thus far they have always waked up and called the traitors and factionists to account. Charles I. trampled on the Constitution. He had judges who decided that his will was the law, and all who resisted that will and defended the Constitution were punished as disloyal. And it did seem as if his power was irresistible. No doubt if you weak-kneed Radicals of the South had lived in that day you would have said, "the Constitution is dead and we must consent to what we cannot resist." But John Hampden would not consent. He resisted. He was tried as a criminal for resisting, and was condemned. But what was the sequel? The people finally asserted their power. Charles and his ministers perished. The very judges that condemned Hampden were themselves tried and condemned as criminals, and the very officers, even the sheriffs, who executed the orders of Charles and his courts, were sued by the citizens for damages, and had to pay nearly a million of dollars for executing the processes of a void, unconstitutional law! For a time traitors held the power and trampled on rights, but vengeance came, and perpetual infamy followed. So Cromwell and his Parliament violated the Constitution, and though they also flourished for a season, they, too, were overthrown. So James II. trampled on the Constitution, and had to fly from his kingdom a fugitive for life. In all these struggles good men, for a time, ruled, but the English race have never yet failed to rescue their Constitution from the power, both of traitors and factionists. I tell you the American people will not always be deceived. They will rise in defense of their Constitution, and traitors will tremble. They who rallied three million strong to defeat what they considered an armed assault on the Constitution and Union, will not sleep until a few hundred traitors from behind the unkept battery of Congressional oaths and deceptive pretensions of loyalty shall utterly batter down the Constitution and Union forever. I warn you, beautiful, radiant idealists, by the history of your own fathers, by every instinct of manhood, by every right of liberty and every impulse of justice, that the day is coming when you will feel the power of an outraged and betrayed people! [Applause.] Go on confiscating! Arrest without warrant or probable cause; destroy homes; persecute men by law; abrogate State govern-

ments; and get your scheme from the criminals of long ago. If I did steal, I would try to steal something better and from a more respectable source.

If you will examine, and compare with former times, the productions of such men as Stevens, Phillips, and Sumner, and their lesser followers and second-hand plagiarizers down South, you will find all their miserable jargon about "liberty and equality," the "natural right of man," and "born-right of manhood suffrage," are borrowed from the men who fomented social and civil wars in Rome, and which have been repeated in every age since, by those who have no statesmanship but the devilish ability of exciting ignorant men to cut each other's throats. Republican Rome had a large number of slaves, freedmen, and non-voting citizens. She had a landed aristocracy embracing comparatively few of her people.

An agrarian law was proposed, and for a time was immensely popular, but it failed and its first author was slain. His brother renewed the law and enlarged it by proposing suffrage to the slaves and freedmen with equal political rights. It was said "there could be no freedom without equality." But the brother's plan perished. Then a great general became the leader of the Radicals of that day, and he had more fame and merit and ability than all the Radical party of his day combined, but he also failed. And why did they all fail? Because they were attempting to engrave a government of force and robbery upon republican forms—attempting the absurd task of making equal things which God had made unequal—attempting equality by taking that which industrious and frugal men had made and giving it to thievery vagabond and by depositing in the keeping of ignorance and vice powers and trusts which intelligence alone can know how to exercise and preserve.

But by the struggle Republican Rome perished and never knew liberty again. Nor was this all; her history from the beginning of the agrarian attempt was one of blood, and faction, and waste, and ruin, until the goal of Empire was reached. In the social and civil wars which marked the struggle, more than seven hundred thousand of her best citizens were slain; and besides these, whole populations of some of her most populous territories may be said to have been so crazy in leaving the country—the only Ark of safety—that our Heavenly father has doomed us to perish, but I am gratified with a hope that it is not so. If, not, there is but one method for our rescue, and that is by a prompt restoration of the Constitution. Will it come? Will we escape an agrarian war with resulting despotism, and save our institutions for our institutions for our children? I hope we shall; I believe we shall. Though a great effort is being made—a designed effort—to destroy us as Rome was destroyed, I believe the effort will fail. I have great faith in the Anglo-Saxon blood. I derive great encouragement from Anglo-Saxon history. Our liberty was not born in a day. It is not the work of one generation. It is the fruits of a hundred struggles, and its guaranties have been perfecting for eight hundred years. Many have been the efforts to destroy it. Often the English Constitution was trampled on. Often traitors sought to substitute arbitrary will for well established law, and often have the people for a time been misled. But thus far they have always waked up and called the traitors and factionists to account. Charles I. trampled on the Constitution. He had judges who decided that his will was the law, and all who resisted that will and defended the Constitution were punished as disloyal. And it did seem as if his power was irresistible. No doubt if you weak-kneed Radicals of the South had lived in that day you would have said, "the Constitution is dead and we must consent to what we cannot resist." But John Hampden would not consent. He resisted. He was tried as a criminal for resisting, and was condemned. But what was the sequel? The people finally asserted their power. Charles and his ministers perished. The very judges that condemned Hampden were themselves tried and condemned as criminals, and the very officers, even the sheriffs, who executed the orders of Charles and his courts, were sued by the citizens for damages, and had to pay nearly a million of dollars for executing the processes of a void, unconstitutional law! For a time traitors held the power and trampled on rights, but vengeance came, and perpetual infamy followed.

So Cromwell and his Parliament violated the Constitution, and though they also flourished for a season, they, too, were overthrown. So James II. trampled on the Constitution, and had to fly from his kingdom a fugitive for life. In all these struggles good men, for a time, ruled, but the English race have never yet failed to rescue their Constitution from the power, both of traitors and factionists. I tell you the American people will not always be deceived. They will rise in defense of their Constitution, and traitors will tremble. They who rallied three million strong to defeat what they considered an armed assault on the Constitution and Union, will not sleep until a few hundred traitors from behind the unkept battery of Congressional oaths and deceptive pretensions of loyalty shall utterly batter down the Constitution and Union forever. I warn you, beautiful, radiant idealists, by the history of your own fathers, by every instinct of manhood, by every right of liberty and every impulse of justice, that the day is coming when you will feel the power of an outraged and betrayed people! [Applause.] Go on confiscating! Arrest without warrant or probable cause; destroy homes; persecute men by law; abrogate State govern-

ments; and get your scheme from the criminals of long ago. If I did steal, I would try to steal something better and from a more respectable source. If you will examine, and compare with former times, the productions of such men as Stevens, Phillips, and Sumner, and their lesser followers and second-hand plagiarizers down South, you will find all their miserable jargon about "liberty and equality," the "natural right of man," and "born-right of manhood suffrage," are borrowed from the men who fomented social and civil wars in Rome, and which have been repeated in every age since, by those who have no statesmanship but the devilish ability of exciting ignorant men to cut each other's throats. Republican Rome had a large number of slaves, freedmen, and non-voting citizens. She had a landed aristocracy embracing comparatively few of her people.

An agrarian law was proposed, and for a time was immensely popular, but it failed and its first author was slain. His brother renewed the law and enlarged it by proposing suffrage to the slaves and freedmen with equal political rights. It was said "there could be no freedom without equality." But the brother's plan perished. Then a great general became the leader of the Radicals of that day, and he had more fame and merit and ability than all the Radical party of his day combined, but he also failed. And why did they all fail? Because they were attempting to engrave a government of force and robbery upon republican forms—attempting the absurd task of making equal things which God had made unequal—attempting equality by taking that which industrious and frugal men had made and giving it to thievery vagabond and by depositing in the keeping of ignorance and vice powers and trusts which intelligence alone can know how to exercise and preserve. But by the struggle Republican Rome perished and never knew liberty again. Nor was this all; her history from the beginning of the agrarian attempt was one of blood, and faction, and waste, and ruin, until the goal of Empire was reached. In the social and civil wars which marked the struggle, more than seven hundred thousand of her best citizens were slain; and besides these, whole populations of some of her most populous territories may be said to have been so crazy in leaving the country—the only Ark of safety—that our Heavenly father has doomed us to perish, but I am gratified with a hope that it is not so. If, not, there is but one method for our rescue, and that is by a prompt restoration of the Constitution. Will it come? Will we escape an agrarian war with resulting despotism, and save our institutions for our institutions for our children? I hope we shall; I believe we shall. Though a great effort is being made—a designed effort—to destroy us as Rome was destroyed, I believe the effort will fail. I have great faith in the Anglo-Saxon blood. I derive great encouragement from Anglo-Saxon history. Our liberty was not born in a day. It is not the work of one generation. It is the fruits of a hundred struggles, and its guaranties have been perfecting for eight hundred years. Many have been the efforts to destroy it. Often the English Constitution was trampled on. Often traitors sought to substitute arbitrary will for well established law, and often have the people for a time been misled. But thus far they have always waked up and called the traitors and factionists to account. Charles I. trampled on the Constitution. He had judges who decided that his will was the law, and all who resisted that will and defended the Constitution were punished as disloyal. And it did seem as if his power was irresistible. No doubt if you weak-kneed Radicals of the South had lived in that day you would have said, "the Constitution is dead and we must consent to what we cannot resist." But John Hampden would not consent. He resisted. He was tried as a criminal for resisting, and was condemned. But what was the sequel? The people finally asserted their power. Charles and his ministers perished. The very judges that condemned Hampden were themselves tried and condemned as criminals, and the very officers, even the sheriffs, who executed the orders of Charles and his courts, were sued by the citizens for damages, and had to pay nearly a million of dollars for executing the processes of a void, unconstitutional law! For a time traitors held the power and trampled on rights, but vengeance came, and perpetual infamy followed.